

# European journal of Archaeology

## General Editor

John Chapman *University of Durham, UK*

## Editorial Board

Teresa Chapa Brunet

Felipe Criado Boado *University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain*

Kostas Kotsakis *University of Thessaloniki, Greece*

Viktor Trifunov *Institute for History of Material Culture, St Petersburg, Russia*

Natalie Venclová *Institute of Archaeology, Prague, Czech Republic*

Paul Wagner *Landschaftsverband Rheinland Amt für Bodendenkmalpflege, Germany*

## Reviews Editor

Peter Biehl *University of California, Berkeley, USA*

## Assistant Reviews Editor

Alexander Gramsch, *Germany Free University of Berlin*

### AIMS AND SCOPE

The publication organ of the European Association of Archaeologists, the *European Journal of Archaeology* (published from 1993 to 1997 as the *Journal of European Archaeology*, vols 1-5) seeks to promote open debate amongst archaeologists committed to a new idea of Europe in which there is more communication across national frontiers and more interest in interpretation. The journal accepts not only new empirical data and new interpretations of the past but also encourages debate about the role archaeology plays in society, how it should be organized in a changing Europe, and the ethics of archaeological practice. All periods are covered; papers, review articles, interviews and short 'debate' pieces are all sought.

*European Journal of Archaeology* (ISSN 1461-9571) is published three times a year in April, August and December by Sage Publications (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi) in association with the European Association of Archaeologists.

Annual subscription (2000): full rate (includes electronic version) £138/US\$221; reduced individual rate: £37/US\$59. Prices include postage. Full rate subscriptions include the right for members of the subscribing institution to access the electronic content of the journal at no extra charge from Sage. The content can be accessed online through a number of electronic journal intermediaries, who may charge for access. Full details available on our website: <http://www.sagepub.co.uk>. Further subscription details and advertising details are available from the Marketing Department, Sage Publications Ltd, 6 Bonhill Street, London EC2A 4PU, UK [email: [subscription@sagepub.co.uk](mailto:subscription@sagepub.co.uk)]; and in North America from Sage Publications Ltd, PO Box 5096, Thousand Oaks, CA 91359, USA. Individual subscription is included as part of the annual membership fees of the European Association of Archaeologists. For further details of membership categories and benefits, including reduced rates for students and Eastern European countries, please contact the EAA Secretariat, Box 102 59, S-434 23, Kungsbacka, Sweden [email: [petra.nordin@raa.se](mailto:petra.nordin@raa.se)]. The Secretariat also deals with back numbers of the *Journal of European Archaeology*.

Copyright © 2000 Editorial Board of the *European Journal of Archaeology* and Sage Publications. Apart from fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, and only as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the Publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the Publishers at the above-mentioned address.

See the inside back cover for information for contributors.

Typeset in Palatino by BC Typesetting, Keynsham, Bristol, UK.

Printed in Great Britain by The Alden Press, Oxford, on acid free paper.

Cover: Detail of a ground penetrating radar profile from a survey in Carlisle, Cumbria, carried out by the Clark Laboratory at the Museum of London Archaeology Service.

Cover designed by Tracy Wellman, MolAS.

# European journal of Archaeology

VOLUME 3 2000

Edited by John Chapman

April 2000



SAGE Publications

and the

European  
Association of  
Archaeologists

restricted to buried remains or fragmentary structures. Intellectually there is a continuum from prehistoric rock art to the architecture of the Modern Movement and beyond, which can be studied using the complex of disciplines and techniques known collectively as 'archaeology'. The protection and conservation of this vast body of material evidence, of which 'archaeological' sites and monuments form a substantial subset, has been the subject of increasingly intensive study and discussion from the Renaissance onwards. It began with humanist scholars and artists in Rome, notably Raphael, who had learned to appreciate the aesthetic qualities of classical art and architecture and intervened with the papacy to prevent the destruction of what had survived. The Enlightenment saw the evolution of cultural paradigms which were to lay the foundations for modern conservation principles and practice. This was a period when archaeology was in its infancy and the high ground of conservation was seized by architects who evolved principles that have tended to dominate the field without reference to archaeologists. Despite the title of this book, therefore, it is of considerable relevance to those whose concern is principally with the archaeological heritage, however narrowly defined.

In its earlier chapters, Rome appears large, since it was here that pioneers such as Johann Joachim Winckelmann and Antonio Canova began to develop a systematic approach to its wealth of classical monuments. Rome attracted scholars and architects from other parts of Italy and Europe who took their theories and practices back to their homelands, most notably to England, France, Prussia and other German states in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Not surprisingly, the strength of property ownership under its common law meant that England was slower than France or Prussia to adopt the concept of an overriding state interest in the protection and conservation of its heritage.

The Italian approach was based primarily on its rich classical heritage, but late eighteenth century England and Germany witnessed the growth of Romanticism, in some measure a reaction against the Age of Reason, and with it the recognition of the

cultural values of Gothic architecture. In his famous essay, *Von deutscher Baukunst*, Goethe identified the architecture of the Middle Ages as a manifestation of the German spirit which was to have a profound influence on the trajectory of conservation in Germany led by Karl-Friedrich Schinkel. This movement also played an important role in France, where Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc was to establish a powerful tradition with his work at Carcassonne, Pierrefonds, Notre-Dame de Paris and elsewhere.

The mid nineteenth century saw a debate raging that was as fierce as that created by the publication of *The Origin of Species*. On the one hand were the advocates of Viollet-le-Duc's approach of systematic restoration (known to its detractors as 'destructive restoration') and, on the other, were those led by John Ruskin and William Morris, founder of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), for whom the historicity of monuments as documents was a concern. The SPAB's philosophy gradually prevailed, its influence spreading to other parts of Europe, and it continues to underlie modern conservation principles and practices. The present century has seen intensive theoretical activity in this field, with notable contributions from Alois Riegl and Cesare Brandi, which Jokilehto synthesizes admirably. It is worthy of note, perhaps, that Brandi somewhat contemptuously rejects the 'archaeological' approach, involving the preservation of every element of a monument, in favour of concentration on its aesthetic qualities.

This excellent book, which complements Alain Schnapp's equally admirable history of archaeology, *La conquête du passé*, is based on a DPhil thesis at the University of York which looked at 'The Contribution of English, French, German and Italian Thought Towards an International Approach to the Conservation of Cultural Property', and, as a result, developments in other countries are dealt with somewhat summarily in the penultimate chapter. The perceptions of monuments and the consequent attitudes to conservation in the Far East, and in particular in Japan, represent a completely different cultural tradition with its own validity which it would be interesting to set alongside

that which developed in Europe and the Americas.

It is also to be regretted that more space is not devoted to reconstruction of individual components of archaeological sites; there are brief comments on controversial reconstructions such as those at Knossos, Babylon, Chan Chan, Nara, and Ephesus. On a larger scale, the postwar reconstructions of the Old City of Warsaw and Gdansk receive – somewhat surprisingly – no more than a passing nod of approval. The reconstruction of Colonial Williamsburg is dealt with at somewhat greater length, but it still leaves the reader wanting more from an author whose knowledge of his subject and experience are unrivalled. But these are minor quibbles: the book itself is an outstanding piece of work which provides a deep historical perspective on a subject that is of immense relevance to everyone concerned with the heritage.

Henry Cleere  
*International Council on Monuments and Sites*  
Paris, France

M. W. Conkey, O. Soffer, D. Stratmann and N. G. Jablonski, eds, *Beyond Art: Pleistocene Image and Symbol*. (San Francisco: California Academy of Sciences, 1997, xi + 378 pp., ISBN: 0 940228 38 6, hbk, \$55, 0 940228 37 8, pbk, \$35)

*Beyond Art* is a very welcome volume about one of the most discussed themes in prehistory. The editors have put together an impressive collection of papers dealing with Pleistocene Art (prehistoric 'art' is used in the sense of prehistoric 'imagery') on a worldwide basis which gives the book an integrity that is missing in a lot of other volumes about art from a remote past. It is time for European archaeologists to realize that there are symbolic manifestations as old as the ones from south-west France and north Spain from Australia to South Africa and even from the Americas.

The book originates from two different symposia the editors organized in Oregon in 1993 and San Francisco in 1995 and is divided into four sections: (a) Analytical

methods: from dating to technologies of image making, (b) Approaches to the 'why' of presence and absence, (c) Interpretations of regional imagery in the European Paleolithic, and (d) The interpretative process.

Although there is only one section with an explicit focus on the European regional imagery, both the historical background of the research of 'Pleistocene Art' and the editors' personal background might explain the predominance of European examples throughout the volume. O. Soffer and M. W. Conkey's introductory chapter can be seen as the core part of the book and formulates most of the questions discussed in the subsequent sections. Without any doubt, this paper should be in every reader on 'Rock Art' seminars. In 'Prehistoric imagery vs prehistoric "art"' the authors scrutinize the pivotal question of why archaeologists should avoid the term 'art' if they want to approach the significance of images and symbols from a remote past. As they state, 'to call them "art" is both misleading and limiting'. Even if some archaeologists might feel uncomfortable, we would like to put forward their conception that 'archaeological data on the issues we explore are full of ambiguity, and . . . this is to be exploited'. The first and the last section of this volume are the most balanced and useful, and therefore, will be the focus of this review. To start with, Watchman's update on archaeometric issues and especially his numerous practical examples provide a clear warning about how carefully we have to consider the results of new techniques. Although his position of blaming archaeologists as a whole for uncritically applying new scientific techniques is extreme, it seems important that he stresses the necessity of always including discussions on the politics behind the archaeological discourse.

J. Clottes' paper on new laboratory techniques shows how those scientific techniques can help to better understand the very important technological procedures of painting. Therefore, his study puts some of the points made by Watchman in a broader context. But Clottes also stresses the importance of achieving a balance between research and preservation when applying those techniques.

Marshack's compelling proposal for the understanding of 'complex symbolic traditions' in south-west Europe and the Middle East has to be seen against the background of the complex academic traditions in this eurocentric discipline. Nevertheless, his interpretation goes well beyond the classic studies of Pleistocene imagery and opens up various avenues for future research in accepting the ambiguity of the archaeological data.

In the last paper of the first section, R. White discusses the substantiality in upper Paleolithic representations and makes a good case – based on evidence from Grimaldi – for considering other aspects behind the aesthetic contemplation such as the fact that the figurines are 'tactile' constructions. In addition to questioning the terminology of art, his explanation of the

significance of those figurines seems to be problematic as has recently been suggested.

The final paper by M. W. Conkey is clearly one of the most valuable papers in the book. Her proposal to broaden our research focus and to not only look inside the caves is especially important. She points out that the archaeologist's own historical specificity has to be included in all studies of visual productions. For Conkey, this is more reasonable than to continue looking after lost myths, especially if we will be able to ground our research in both empirical depth and imaginative power. Therefore, archaeology and the interpretation of early 'art' is always provisional.

Agustín Díez Castillo  
Archaeological Research Facility  
University of California at Berkeley, USA

## C ONFERENCE REVIEW

**Migration und Kulturtransfer: Der Wandel Vorder- und Zentralasiatischer Kulturen im Umbruch vom 2. zum 1. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Eurasien- und Orient-Abteilung. Berlin, Curt-Sachs-Saal des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 23–26 November 1999**

During this conference, which was organized by Herrmann Parzinger and Ricardo Eichmann, the heads of the Departments of Eurasian and Oriental Archaeology of the German Archaeological Institute (DAI), 30 lecturers from several countries including China, Russia, Uzbekistan, Israel, Turkey, France, Italy, Great Britain, the USA and Germany, presented and discussed new data and material from an area reaching from northern China to the Levant.

The transition from the second to the first millennium BC can be described as a period of change in large parts of the ancient world. Scholars from different schools of thought tried to highlight the interdependencies between culturally diverse regions during this process. The participants discussed problems of migration and cultural transfer in Central Asia, the Near East and adjacent areas. The assumption that the movements of sometimes nomadic pastoral groups were the prime cause of cultural change was a prevailing undercurrent in the explanatory models offered at the conference. Yet some of the participants emphasized factors inherent in the cultural systems themselves as being the motor for culture change. Henri-Paul Francfort (Paris), for example, stressed

the importance of local transformations of ideology in contrast to invasion as a factor for change. Theoretical discussions and attempts to classify modes of cultural exchange did not, however, play a leading role in the conference nor, as Parzinger pointed out, were they intended to. The main thrust of the proceedings was to create the empirical material and chronological basis for cultural comparisons over such a vast region.

The presentations of new finds and dates from northwestern China presented by Wu En (Peking) and Mayke Wagner (Berlin) were of outstanding interest. New radiocarbon dates between 1400 and 1000 cal. BC point to the genesis of the Siberian animal style as well as other typical steppe artefacts in this area. Undoubtedly, mobile groups of pastoralists and nomads played an important role in the cultural relations between China and Central Asia at the turn of the second to the first millennium BC. An invaluable source to characterize the people involved are the famous mummies from the province of Xinjiang (Sinkiang) in northwestern China, which were put in a wider context by recent finds from the Siberian Altai by Natalija Polos'mak (Novosibirsk). The routes of mobile people of central Asian origin reached as far as the Indian subcontinent, as rock carvings in Eurasian animal style in the Upper Indus Valley impressively demonstrate (Harald Hauptmann, Istanbul).

Parzinger introduced a new chronology for the late Bronze and early Iron Age in southern Siberia with higher dates for the Andronovo Culture. Mechanisms of change in